STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS WISCONSIN

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 32 Saturday, August 10, 1957 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

MODERN GOP: *Gluck agonistes* (page 1)

STATE DEPARTMENT: *Teheran blackout* (page 2)

BUDGET: *Where it really stands* (page 2)

LABOR: *Dubinsky and Dio* (page 3)

FARMERS: *Caught in the web* (page 4)

Modern Republicans: The tribulations of Maxwell H. Gluck — the Ambassador-designate to Ceylon who could not name the Prime Minister of that country — are chalked up as another fumble for "modern Republicanism." The Gluck appointment was masterminded by Senator Jacob Javits (R.-N.Y.), whose brother Benjamin is a close associate of Gluck's in the World Development Corporation, a grandiose foreign aid project for American business. In urging a governmental spot for his friend Gluck, Javits faced the problem of an excess of diplomatic appointments from New York, and had to cast about for Senatorial sponsorship from another state.

It has been reported that the Gluck forces tried to secure endorsement from Ohio Senators Bricker (R.) and Lausche (D.) — the indicated step in political procedure, since Gluck had spent his early days in and around Ohio. Bricker's office states, however, that no attempt was made to attain his sponsorship, and Senator Lausche advises HUMAN EVENTS that he was never approached on the subject.

As a substitute for backing from the Ohio conservatives, the Gluck forces went to two of the prize "modern Republicans" in the Senate, John Sherman Cooper and Thruston Morton of Kentucky — where Gluck owns a horse farm. Cooper and Morton obliged.

On the State Department end of the transaction was another exemplary "modern" — Under Secretary Christian Herter, who offered a limp defense of the appointment to the Foreign Relations Committee ("Mr. Gluck is described as a modest unassuming person with a quiet manner"). Herter — said to be grooming himself for the Secretaryship by steering clear of all controversial topics — found himself up to his neck in the Gluck mess as Democratic Senators popped hostile questions at him.

Herter is held accountable for Gluck's disastrous showing under committee questioning. Appointment of wealthy party contributors to ambassadorial posts, it is pointed out, is an ancient practice in Washington. And the appointees frequently have had neither special qualifications for their positions nor statesmanlike understanding of foreign affairs. In these respects, the Gluck appointment was not unusual. What was so incredible, say Washington newsmen, was that Herter could let Gluck crucify himself before the Senate committee without sufficient briefing on elementary facts about Ceylon and Southeast Asia. If he had been grounded in even the most obvious phases (like the name of India's Prime Minister Nehru), *l'affaire* Gluck would have never taken place.

The World Development Corporation, which Gluck leaves to take up his ambassadorial spot, provides an insight into Gluck's own political predilections, and supplies another "modern Republican" facet to the many-sided debacle. In two books, *Peace by Investment* and *How the Republicans Can Win in 1952*, Benjamin Javits set forth the program of the World Development Corporation. WDC, Javits said, would involve a "fifty-year plan of investment by American business and industry in the rest of the world."

Javits envisioned a total investment figure of $2 trillion — half of it to be supplied by Americans. Spread over 50 years, Javits concluded, America's share would come to "only" $20 billion a year. Such is the thinking behind the Javits-Gluck World Development Corporation.

Whose Victory? As the House wrestles with the revised "civil rights" bill passed by the Senate last week, political analysts ponder the question: who actually won the fight? The answer lies in unravelling tangled lines of Senate strategy:

1) Confronted with the Administration's harsh original draft, Southern Senators were faced with two choices — to work for changes that would "water down" the bill, or to count on the objectionable features to give them enough allies to defeat it. They chose the first.

2) Once committed to the course of striking the worst sections of the bill, the Southern Senators had to follow through — and did so brilliantly. They could not forget, however, that every battle won brought them closer to ultimate defeat in the war — passage of the bill itself.

3) Final passage, minus Section III and plus the jury trial amendment, was not greeted enthusiastically by "liberal" commentators — indicating that they found the result distasteful. Southern legislators have been unanimous, however, in expressing their bitter-end opposition to any "civil rights" legislation. The present bill, setting up a Commission with subpoena powers to investigate alleged denials of voting rights, is unacceptable. Southern Congressmen say: "I cannot vote for any 'civil rights' bill, however weak. Final pas-

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sage of the present bill, even in its weakened form, would represent a defeat for the South."

Why, then, did the Southern Senators follow the tactic of amending the bill to make it more acceptable?

4) They were relying on "strategy in depth" for ultimate victory. In producing a Senate bill so modified from the original, they counted on the fanaticism of extreme "liberals" in the House to produce a stalemate. If current trends toward compromise triumph, however, and the bill slips through the House gauntlet, they hope the pride of the President — who has spoken bitterly against the changed version — will produce a veto.

McElroy: The nomination of Neil H. McElroy, President of Procter & Gamble, to succeed "Charlie" Wilson as Secretary of Defense has stirred curiosity as to where the new occupant of this vital post will stand politically. Most Senators know little of the new appointee, except that he is a "self-made" businessman in the classical mould. A search for political clues unearths one key fact, suggesting that McElroy may be considerably less conservative than his background would indicate:

His one previous foray into national politics was as Chairman of the widely criticized White House Conference on Education — breeding ground for the recently defeated Federal Aid to Schools bill.

Whatever McElroy's political persuasion, "liberal" or conservative, Washingtonians doubt that he will have much effect on Pentagon spending policies — firmly under the control of the permanent Pentagon bureaucracy headed by a Truman holdover, Assistant Secretary W. J. McNeil (see HUMAN EVENTS for July 27, 1957).

Historical Blackout: The release of captured Nazi documents last week by the U.S. State Department, in collaboration with the British Foreign Office, is viewed with skepticism in the Capital. Students of bureaucratic folkways point out that beneath the "flimflam" about the glamorous Duke of Windsor was a copious wad of gossip and innuendo about conservative Americans — such as John T. Flynn and Fulton Lewis, Jr. — implying that they had offered aid and comfort to the Nazis.

The sin of such "isolationists," it develops, is that they were critical of FDR in the days when he moved heaven and earth to scheme the United States into World War II. Capital veterans say it is an "odd coincidence" that the left-wing State Department, which for ten years has kept a padlock on the vital diplomatic record of World War II, should labor prodigiously and bring forth material so useful to "liberal" sermonizers against "isolationism."

One expert on the State Department "double standard" of what merits publication had ready a withering comment on the release of the documents. Bryton Barron, author of *Inside the State Department*, and for 26 years a career State Department official, told HUMAN EVENTS this week:

"Our officials have proved to be very generous in releasing material that can be used as ammunition against conservative Americans; but getting information about the important diplomatic 'sellouts' of the war is almost impossible. A great hullabaloo has been made about the publication of the expurgated Yalta record. Yet is it noteworthy that the proceedings of the much more important Teheran Conference of 1944 have never been released."

Teheran, Barron said, was where the real betrayal began. "Roosevelt was not then — as he was at Yalta — a sick and dying man. The Soviet Union was in no position to demand conciliatory agreements from the United States. And yet at Teheran, Roosevelt reneged on promises made to our Chinese Nationalist allies at the preceding Cairo conference and laid the groundwork for the whole Yalta sellout."

Barron concluded: "It is time that the American people learned the truth about the conferences at Cairo, Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam — for the decisions and secret agreements made then have direct bearing on our survival now. Instead, they are given unfounded gossip about loyal citizens who opposed American intervention in a European war."

Appeasement Notes: Further developments last week in the new drive toward "coexistence" (see HUMAN EVENTS for August 3, 1957):

- American State Department representatives at a Paris trade conference capitulated to demands for increased "free world" trade with the Chinese Communists. Machine tools, metal products, chemicals and transportation equipment — the "sinews of war" — will now move from countries receiving American aid to Red China. American officials stated that they had "no alternative" but to agree, since our aid recipients insisted on the move.
- The Senate, by voice vote, passed a measure authorizing barter of American farm surpluses to Communist countries. Principal beneficiary of the deal is Communist Poland — now in line to receive $95 million worth of American loans and farm goods.

Status of the Budget: The real dimensions of the controversial Budget for Fiscal 1958 have become something of a mystery — even to those who have followed its journey through Congress with considerable care. In the shuffling of legislation from subcommittee to committee, from House to Senate, the status of the Budget has been obscured by a parliamentary fogbank.

To get an authoritative estimate of how successful this year's Budget-cutting has been, HUMAN EVENTS consulted with one of the top fiscal experts in the Capital — acknowledged to have a thorough grasp of Budget matters. After a recap of legislative action to date, and a consultation with Treasury representatives, this authority gave HUMAN EVENTS the following estimate:

- Congress so far has cut roughly $3.86 billion from the appropriations requested by the President.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If no further cuts are made, the revised Budget would stand at $68.06 billion. This reduction, commented the Budget authority, is "unprecedented."

● Further reductions are possible in the appropriations bills for foreign aid, atomic energy, and civilian expenditures in Defense. Slashes here could bring total cuts to over $4 billion — a figure which compares favorably with estimates offered at the opening of this session.

● The dark side of the Budget picture, however, shows opportunities for bureaucratic evasion of Congressional intent. There remain the problem of "unexpended balances" (to the amount of $70 billion) and the refusal of some Government agencies to pace their activities according to the funds allotted to them. In the latter cases, bureaucrats count on their ability to blackmail Congress into granting "deficiency appropriations" when there is too much fiscal year left over at the end of the money.

It is reported that Senator Byrd is preparing a major policy address on the current status of the Budget and related problems (for comment on Byrd and his Budget-cutting career, see "Mr. Byrd of Virginia," by James J. Kilpatrick, in Article Section of this issue).

Dubinsky: Among additional ghosts which may be materialized, for public inspection, by the McClellan Committee: those reportedly in the closet of David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union and a member of the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee.

Dubinsky's name was brought into the committee's hearings by Lester Washburn, former president of the malodorous United Auto Workers (AFL). Washburn told of his unsuccessful efforts in 1954 to rid his union of Johnny Dio, notorious New York racketeer who then was using a UAW-AFL local unit chapter in his operations.

Dubinsky, said Washburn, told him to "get rid of Dio" because he was "no good." But the witness said that when he went to Dubinsky (who then was a leading figure on a pre-merger AFL Ethical Practices Committee) seeking specific information on which he could bring charges against Dio, all he got was a useless file of newspaper clippings.

Then Washburn dropped a small bombshell by saying he reminded Dubinsky that Dio once had worked for the ILGWU as an organizer, and commenting that the ILGWU prexy certainly must know enough about Dio to furnish specific information. He also asked Dubinsky why the latter was keeping in his own union a long-time close associate of Dio; to which, he testified, the answer was, "we consider him less dangerous in than out." (Comment from a press table wag: "Like Truman promoted Harry D. White so the FBI could keep track of him easier.")

Said Washburn, of Dubinsky: ". . . When he was in a position to help and wouldn't help, I just began to wonder why . . . He probably had become involved, is the best I can figure out."

Whether Dubinsky ever will testify is problematical. Some committee members, however, hope that before their investigation ends, it will go into these and other facets of the Dubinsky-ILGWU operations, including its unofficial price-fixing activities.

$25,000 a Year: The political and economic power over employers and workers desired by grasping union leaders has been fully achieved by the motion picture operations local in New York City.

The local — camera and sound men — has about 300 members. To keep the labor supply far below the demand, only one or two members — usually sons of present members — are admitted each year. The per diem scale is $50, but that is only the beginning of a member's remuneration. The scale calls for double time after 7 p.m. and triple time after midnight and on Saturdays and Sundays. Members can have all the regular and overtime work they want.

Non-union camera and sound men make $150 per week or $7,800 per year. A member of the New York local can make $25,000 per year.

Employers, completely at the mercy of the union, must treat members and officials with the utmost deference, otherwise they may find themselves without any means of getting their work done. If an employer is suspected of being critical of the union, only incompetents will be assigned to him.

When members can make $25,000 per year — three times the free-market value of their services — no member will be critical of union officials for fear he will be suspended or expelled and thereby will lose his plush livelihood.

Political Briefs: Results of two recent Gallup polls: 61 per cent of persons interviewed in a nationwide survey "say they tend to agree more with people who believe in states' rights than with those who believe in greater concentration of power in Washington"; 63 per cent said they would vote in favor of a "right-to-work" law in their states. The second survey, commented the Gallup organization, "indicates that many people think unions overstep their rights when they coerce employees into joining unions."

● Testifying before the Senate Finance Committee last week, retiring Under Secretary of the Treasury W. Randolph Burgess advocated return to the gold standard — "when we can do it safely." Burgess offered this opinion in reply to questioning by committee member George W. Malone (R.-Nev.). Both agreed that return to the gold standard may be the only solution to continual inflation.

● Status of Forces footnote: 150 American citizens imprisoned in France faced starvation recently when French prison guards staged a ten-day strike.

● Reversal of World War II "woe-to-the-vanquished" policies is seen in the plan, announced last week, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the "equitable" return of German and Japanese assets seized during the war. The plan, said the White House, "would reflect the historic American policy of maintaining the sanctity of private property even in wartime."

● During last week's hearings on military construction appropriations, Representative Errett P. Scrivner (R.-Kan.) explained to a uniformed witness why Congress was X-raying requests for new base facilities. Career military men, Scrivner told Brigadier General William E. Rentz, seem to have lost touch with "the people that have to support you and your activities." Congressmen find it difficult to defend lavish military appropriations, Scrivner added, "when taxpayers go out and visit these bases and see military people enjoying the things which they cannot enjoy because of the heavy taxes they are having to pay."

Stokes: Among reports of the growing threat of juvenile delinquency in New York, there appeared last week a tragic sidelight: news of the death of author Richard L. Stokes, 74, August 1. Stokes, whose article, "Eisenhower as a Military Man," appeared recently in HUMAN EVENTS (June 22, 1957), died at his New York home hours after he had rescued an elderly man from three young hoodlums in Central Park. The exertion was apparently too much for his heart.

Farm Front: Although various issues such as "civil rights" and the Hells Canyon dam have received a thorough airing this session, America's single greatest domestic "mess" has gone virtually unnoticed: the tangled web of price supports and production quotas that envelops a large segment of American agriculture.

Two recent encounters in nearby Maryland and Virginia, involving names familiar in the Capital, suggest how bad the "mess" really is:

● Former Congressman Alfred N. Phillips (D.-Conn.), who now farms in Maryland, has run athwart the "soil bank." Government authorities have forbidden Phillips to let a neighbor's cattle, starving under the severe Eastern drought, graze on his pastureland. The Government's reasoning: under the soil bank, Phillips' land has been "withdrawn from production."

● In Loudoun County, Virginia, Robert T. Stevens, Jr., son of the former Secretary of the Army, recently found himself being sued by the Government. Stevens' offense: refusing to allow Government inspectors to police the amount of wheat grown on his farm. (The local "agricultural stablization" committee had parcelled out to Stevens a 19-acre quota.) Stevens, who had neither received nor applied for any "supports" on his crops, told the Government: "I have asked for nothing. I do not merchandise any commodities with you . . . in short, I wish you would leave me alone and let me operate my property as I see fit."

Inflation: The per capita standard of living in the U.S. is no longer gaining, and may actually be decreasing, according to noted economist Harold B. Dorsey, writing in the *Washington Post* for August 5. The Consumers' Price Index for the second quarter, Dorsey notes, was 3.6 per cent higher than a year ago. Population increase was 1.8 per cent. The combination of the two requires an increase in the Gross National Product of 5.5 per cent. The Government portion of the GNP increase was 10.1 per cent, while the non-Governmental portion was 4.4 per cent. The segment of the latter which represents personal consumption, says Dorsey, showed a rise of 4.8 per cent, but if adjustment is made for the inflation "froth" and the population increase, per capita consumption showed a decline of 0.7 per cent.

Jefferson Quotes: *State's Rights:* "I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground: that 'all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states or to the people . . .' To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition."

The Supreme Court: "The judiciary of the United States is a subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working under ground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric. They are construing our Constitution from a coordination of general and special government to a general and supreme one alone. . . . Having found from experience that impeachment is an impracticable thing, a mere scare-crow, they consider themselves secure for life; they sculk from responsibility to public opinion . . . An opinion is huddled up in a conclave, perhaps by a majority of one, delivered as if unanimous, and with the silent acquiesence of lazy or timid associates, by a crafty chief judge, who sophisticates the law to his mind, by the turn of his own reasoning."

Letter from LOUIS C. WYMAN, Attorney General of New Hampshire, President, National Association of Attorneys General: "I find HUMAN EVENTS, with the majority of its enclosures, to be interesting and most of the time challengingly accurate. This is in refreshing contrast to editorial points of view which in too many instances have become reasoned exercises in rationalization to a predetermined point of view."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 32 HUMAN EVENTS August 10, 1957

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

MR. BYRD OF VIRGINIA

At 70, He Continues His Great Career

STATE COLLEGE
WISCONSIN

By JAMES J. KILPATRICK

EVERY FRIDAY evening, the debates of the United States Senate permitting, Harry Flood Byrd drives the 60-odd miles from Washington to his home at Berryville, Virginia. It is a pleasant drive at almost any season of the year, through the rolling hunt country of Fairfax and Loudoun Counties, across the Shenandoah River, finally up a winding drive to the white-columned mansion, Rosemont, where dinner is waiting for him. From his verandah he can rest his eyes on a countryside so perfect it might have been clipped from a British travel poster – chimneys and steeples, and tree-lined country roads, and far away the soft, slate shadows of the Blue Ridge Mountains.

Here the senior Senator from Virginia finds not only a few hours of rest and relaxation, but more deeply, a sort of spiritual purging and renewal. Here are his land, his well-ordered orchards, his state. On Saturday mornings, when he goes to his office in the Winchester *Star* building, he can study the neat, comprehensible figures of his farming operations. Saturday afternoons, in an old pair of pants and some worn hiking shoes, he can occupy himself with the realities of a farmer's world – scale on the Winesaps, the yield of Red Delicious. By Sunday night, when he drives back to the Shoreham and to the maelstrom of Washington, he is ready for another week of struggling against the forces of centralization he has resisted so long.

Harry Byrd is 70 now. He has been in public life for 50 years, from the time he was elected – he was not quite 21 – to the City Council of Winchester. He was a State Senator at 28, Governor of Virginia at 39; he has served as a Senator from Virginia since March of 1933. Today he is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, third in seniority in the upper chamber, by general agreement one of the most powerful men on the Hill.

There are paradoxes in the Senator's make-up, as there doubtless are in every man's. He was raised in a state that prides itself on tobacco and fine liquor, but the Senator neither smokes nor drinks. He is a lifelong Democrat, with one of the most remarkable Republican voting records in the Senate. His every political instinct is conservative, yet his four-year term as Governor of Virginia was marked by the most radical innovations in the state's government in this century.

But the student who delights in the inconsistencies of man, and in documenting the expedient about-faces of the average political leader, can glean little from Byrd's career. Thirty-four years ago, when he led a fight in Virginia to keep the state's highway system free of debt, Harry Byrd was crying for economy, efficiency and sound finance. He was fighting for states' rights and quoting the Tenth Amendment when Harding was in the White House. He has never swerved, never shifted. In a woefully unstable time, when old institutions totter or take on new faces, the Senator goes steadfastly on his way. He is an aristocrat, in the oldest and deepest meaning of the Greek root-word – in the same sense that Jefferson, who was also a good politician, was an aristocrat, too; which is to say that Byrd believes in government by the best men the state can provide, and by "best" he means not necessarily the most brilliant or the most cultured, but the most honest, most industrious and most high-minded men.

Does all this depict the gentleman from Virginia as some paragon of virtue, an iceberg of gentility in a sea of common politicians? If so, the words are ill chosen. Byrd is essentially a gregarious person, with a lusty laugh and a childlike love of a good story. He actively enjoys making a speech before Rotary or Kiwanis; his battered felt hat exudes a characteristic informality; he is one of the easiest men in Washington for a reporter to reach by telephone. Byrd could not live down his illustrious ancestry if he wanted to, and he doesn't want to; but he doesn't take himself too seriously either.

THE BYRDS OF VIRGINIA go back to William Byrd I (1652-1704), a wealthy gentleman who laid out the City of Richmond and still is known affectionately in the state capital as Father Byrd. His son was William Byrd II (1674-1744), builder of the fabulous plantation known as Westover, a power in colonial times. Unhappily, the next Byrd in line was William III, who gambled away the rich inheritance of his

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

father and left the family with neither position nor special prominence during the turbulent days of the Revolution. Next in line was Thomas Taylor Byrd (1752-1821), a farmer who established the clan in Clarke County. His son was the first Richard Evelyn Byrd, a lawyer in Winchester; his son, in turn, was a Colonel William Byrd, who migrated to Texas, became adjutant general of the State, and in time commanded a Confederate cavalry unit. It was in Austin, Texas, that the Senator's father, Richard Evelyn Byrd, was born in 1860. Soon after the War, the family returned to Virginia, and in time Richard Evelyn embarked upon a political career that saw him become Speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates.

Harry Flood Byrd was born in Martinsburg, West Virginia, June 10, 1887. He was named for his mother's only brother. When two more boys came along, the infants were christened, with a puckish fealty to family tradition, Tom and Dick. After a distinguished career in World War I, Tom settled down in Clarke County as a quiet farmer and apple grower; Dick, of course, became Admiral of the Polar Seas; Harry took to politics.

The boys were born into a family rich in history but short on cash. At 15, as the oldest son, Harry dropped out of school to do what he could toward improving the family fortunes. He rented a part interest in a small apple orchard, and began his days at 4:30 a.m. with a hand sprayer. He worked most of the day for the local telephone company. He saw an opportunity in the bankrupt weekly *Star*. It was an Horatio Alger story. His earnings on one orchard provided an equity in another; by the time he was 21 he was running the telephone company; he managed to get the *Star* back on its feet by driving into West Virginia every Wednesday with enough cash to buy paper for the week's press run. Today the Byrd family's holdings in Virginia and West Virginia constitute the largest private apple orchards in the world, and the *Star*, edited by State Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., is a thriving daily.

It was inevitable that the Senator should have gone early into politics. By the time his father won election to the Virginia House of Delegates in 1906, the 19-year-old son was saturated with politics. His mother's father and grandfather had served in the Virginia Assembly; another of her grandfathers had served as ambassador to France under Buchanan; her uncle was a United States Senator from West Virginia; her brother, "Uncle Hal" Flood, was for years a member of the House of Representatives. Household conversation revolved constantly about the tribulations of the Democratic party. In 1915 young Mr. Byrd became State Senator Byrd, and his career was on the way.

Political affairs in Virginia at this time were pretty much dominated by United States Senator Thomas S. Martin, a colorless figure who held a loose alliance with the powerful Methodist minister, James Cannon, Jr. Then, in a relatively short span of time, several events came together: Martin died, Cannon was raised to the bishopric and assigned temporarily away from Virginia, and there arose the road bond fight of 1923. Harry Byrd, hating public debt, swiftly found himself leading opposition to the bond issue. He adopted John Randolph's magic slogan, "Pay as we go!" and swept the State with passionate arguments against indebtedness. When the votes were counted, the bond issue was defeated by nearly 50,000 votes ("we would have turned out another 50,000 to vote against it," Byrd once recalled, "if the farmers could have driven through the mud to get to the polls.") And with the results of the referendum, Byrd was pushed into the vacuum of political leadership created by Martin's death.

At that, he might have remained in the State Senate and tended his orchards if a chance remark at New York had not raised his temper. Attending the Democratic National Convention of 1924, Byrd found himself in a taxi with Bishop Cannon. The bishop, who still regarded Virginia as his political see, coldly advised Byrd not even to think of running for Governor. "We," said the bishop, "have decided to elect Walter Mapp." Four months later, Byrd announced his own candidacy, and in the Democratic primary of 1925 he had the pleasure of defeating Cannon's nominee by an overwhelming margin.

BYRD'S TERM AS GOVERNOR of Virginia, from 1926 to 1930, is vividly remembered in the state to this day. There had been nothing like it before; there has been nothing like it since. He undertook a wholesale reorganization of the top-heavy state bureaucracy and, amazingly, won easy legislative approval of reforms that most observers had thought impossible. Ninety-five State agencies were regrouped under 12 departments (40 agencies were abolished altogether). There had been 48 separate agencies collecting or disbursing state funds; these were boiled into one office of a State Treasurer. Byrd instituted an eight-hour day for state employees who had been working seven hours. More significantly, Byrd threw his whole support behind a movement to revise the Virginia Constitution of 1902. A constitutional convention would have cost at least $500,000, and would have proclaimed amendments without direct approval of the people. Governor Byrd, as an alternative, named a small commission of outstanding attorneys (the commission spent a frugal $5,000 only), which recommended 47 material amendments to the Constitution.

These changes were approved by the General Assembly, and in June, 1928, were approved by the people. Interestingly, one change increased the State Supreme Court from five to seven members. Byrd declined to name the new justices, and forthrightly explained why: "I assured the public in my speeches

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advocating the proposed amendments that their adoption would give me no new appointments during my term. I believed that statement when I made it, and I expected the people to believe it when they heard it."

By the time Byrd went out of office in January of 1930, state taxes had been reduced; the state debt had been lowered by $4 million; a strong anti-lynching bill had been written into law (Virginia has not had a lynching since then), and mileage in the state highway system had increased by 45 per cent. Byrd's "Program of Progress," as he proudly called it, was an astonishing achievement in a state accustomed to moving, if at all, with painful slowness. The record caused Byrd to be nominated as Virginia's favorite son during the Democratic convention of 1932; and the following year, when Claude Swanson resigned his seat in the United States Senate to become Secretary of the Navy, no other appointment could have been made but that of Harry Byrd. He took his seat March 4, 1933, and has held it against all challengers from that day to this.

STRANGE AS IT MAY SOUND now, Byrd went to the Senate as a New Dealer. He cheerfully describes himself, even today, as "one of the last of the old New Dealers." The Democratic platform of 1932, he has often asserted, was an admirable platform. "I am still standing on it." The platform called for a reduction in Federal spending, for a renewed dedication to states' rights, for economy in government. The first bill that Byrd voted on was a bill "to preserve the credit of the United States Government."

Before many months had passed, to be sure, the platform that was to have been so faithfully kept had been summarily discarded. Senator Byrd, surprised and resentful, began building up the record of fierce party independence that he continues to compile today. He voted against the NIRA, the Guffey Coal Act, the AAA, the Wagner Act. He sought a program of Federal reorganization, only to have his efforts frustrated by President Roosevelt's ambitious plans. To Byrd's absolute horror, the Federal Budget began going ever deeper in the red. Speaking to the Academy of Political Science in New York in 1937, the Senator observed in awe that "the Federal Government has spent in seven years the incredible sum of $47,000,000,000." It is inevitable, he asserted, "that the national credit will be impaired unless we retrench."

Byrd's repeated demands for a balanced Budget led to a memorable exchange late in 1938 with Marriner S. Eccles, then Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. In a public letter on December 26, Eccles ridiculed Byrd's adherence to "those old-fashioned virtues of thrift, frugality, self-reliance and industry." Byrd waited until January 16, and then fired a devastating reply. The Senator has a gift for pungent political attack; he took Mr. Eccles' hide clean off. His statement was widely commented upon then; it is excellent reading today.

Yet it is notable that in succeeding months, Byrd the economizer became Byrd the advocate of greater spending—greater spending on defense. In one speech after another, he needled the White House for what seemed to him inadequate outlays for the armed services. At one point, the President devoted a fireside chat to assuring the public that things were not so bad as the gentleman from Virginia believed. Roosevelt, though often sorely irritated by Senator Byrd, remained on good terms with him to the end. He loved to poke fun at the Virginian's incessant cries for economy, and made the mistake, just prior to his fourth inaugural, of remarking publicly that he would show Byrd and his fellow economizers a few things: he wouldn't spend a cent on his inauguration. Senator Byrd, who by accident of his chairmanship of the Rules Committee was chairman of the inaugural committee, took him at his word. At Byrd's request an appropriation for the ceremony was held to $25,000, half the usual cost. Out of this, Byrd agreed to pay $700 in printing costs only, and while FDR fumed the Senator blandly turned back $24,300.

Byrd had played a significant role in the first nomination of Roosevelt in 1932; he also had given a boost to Truman's bid for the vice presidency at the convention of 1944, though not for any special love for Harry Truman (Byrd's only interest was in blocking Henry Wallace). As events worked out, the Virginian was even cooler to the Fair Deal than he had been to the Rooseveltian New Deal. The week after World War II ended, Byrd called publicly for a cut-back in the Federal payroll to the pre-war level of one million employees. Badgerlike, he went after Mr. Truman's budgets with unrelenting zeal. Every January, with the assistance of his crack staffman, Heywood Bell, Jr., the Senator worked up a "Byrd Budget," to show that appropriations really could be cut by specific amounts. It was this monumental labor on Byrd's part that provoked and infuriated Truman into the historic declaration that there were "too many Byrds in Congress." The Senator's expression, when he first heard of the remark, was one of absolute glee.

Byrd's repeated conflicts with the White House during the Truman Administration not unnaturally offended disciples of "party loyalty." He was often accused of "voting with the Republicans." For a time, Byrd passed off the charge with a good-humored comment that "my name begins with a 'B,' so I vote first and the Republicans vote with me." But at one point, the Senator delivered a tart reply to an insistent questioner who kept wanting to know, "What kind of Democrat are you?" Byrd's response was quoted by the *Washington Post* in 1951:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I want to tell you what kind of a Democrat I am. I am not a Republican, I will tell you that. I vote with them when they are right, and against them when they are wrong, but I am not a Republican. The kind of Democrat that I try earnestly to be is that kind of Democrat that two of the greatest presidents of these United States were, both from Virginia, Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson. The kind of Democrat I try to be is the kind that Andrew Jackson was, who boasted that the proudest achievement of his administration was to pay off *in toto* the public debt. That is an opportunity that no one will ever have again. I am the kind of a Democrat that Grover Cleveland was, who said . . . it was the duty of the people to support the Government, and not the Government, the people . . . The test of my vote in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, is determined by what I believe to be best for my country."

That may seem a hackneyed peroration. Byrd means it. Time after time he has offended powerful interests in Virginia by his uncompromising independence of spirit. He has refused to support merely desirable, but nonessential, public improvements in his own Virginia. Late in 1951, less than a year before his most bitter fight for re-election, he rejected a plea from Virginia veterans that a VA district office in Richmond be maintained. "I do not feel that I can sincerely talk economy in Washington and oppose economy in Federal operations in Virginia," said Byrd. And that was that.

BUT STATESMAN that he is, the senior Senator from Virginia is a thorough politician also. Now and then it appears that his hold on the "Byrd Organization" (known to his foes as the "Byrd Machine") may be slipping. But every time the Organization has been written off as an aggregation of old mossbacks, it bounces back to life more vigorous than before. Like the imperturable oyster, the Organization has a way of sucking in irritants and turning them into pearls. Through a process of genteel persuasion, so quiet as to be barely audible, unseemly controversies generally are avoided. When the Organization is pushed into a fight, as it was in the Virginia gubernatorial race of 1949 and again in the Senator's own campaign of 1952, the Organization fights like a catamount. Byrd has a hot temper; he sometimes has difficulty keeping it under control.

Most of the time, however, he is as cool as the white suits he wears throughout the summer months. In the Senate, he is a behind-the-scenes man. He seldom speaks on the floor, perhaps because he is not an exceptional orator. His voice is rather high-pitched; he has little sense of timing. Yet he is a superlative organizer and skilled parliamentarian. Presiding over the Finance Committee, he is often fretful with bores on the witness stand, and ignorance of easily ascertainable figures causes him acute anguish. He has been working on the Federal Budget so long that his mind is a storehouse of itemized facts on spending. If there is one criticism to be made of his public statements, it is the unusual complaint that they have too many facts — too many detailed figures that are clear to Senator Byrd but often obscure to others.

What is ahead for Byrd? The presumption in Virginia is that he will, of course, run for another term next year. He has offended many party-line Democrats by his unwillingness to support Adlai Stevenson in 1952 and 1956; he is a continuing irritation to the state's "liberals" and globalists; his uncompromising advocacy of "massive resistance" to race-mixing in the public schools would align the growing Negro vote against him. Yet the same factors have served to enhance the affection in which Byrd is held by conservative Virginians who are appalled by the course of the national Democratic party; his stand on the school segregation issue unquestionably is admired by the bulk of the people. At this writing, there is no Democrat, and certainly no Republican, who could give him much of a contest.

Thus the prospect is that Byrd will be around for a long time to come. Virginians hope so, for they are intensely proud of him. If his voice often seems to be the voice of one crying in the wilderness, they are confident that he, at least, sees the straight way.

James J. Kilpatrick, author of *The Sovereign States* (Regnery), is Editor of *The Richmond News Leader*. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "The Sovereign States — How Americans Can End Federal Usurpation," November 3, 1956.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "MR. BYRD OF VIRGINIA"

at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED